

REMARKS

Claims 33-38, and 44 have been amended to clarify what Applicant regards as the invention, and to correct minor matter of form. No new matter has been added.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 33, 35, 36, 38-40, 43-46, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,311,146 (“Wonder”). Applicant respectfully notes that in order to sustain a rejection under §102, each element in the rejected claim must be found, either expressly or inherently, in the cited reference.

Claims 33-37

Claim 33 recites a catheter having a distal section that can be expanded to release an implant from the distal section. Wonder does not disclose or suggest such a device. Rather, Wonder discloses an implantable balloon 110 that can be detached from a catheter 102 after the balloon (not the catheter 102) is inflated (Figures 4 and 5, Column 7, lines 31-51). Particularly, the implantable balloon 110 includes a collar 118 that can be expanded to release the balloon 110 from the catheter 102. As such, Wonder does not disclose a catheter having an expandable distal section from which an implant is released. According to the Office Action, the catheter 102 of Wonder also expands to release the balloon. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The catheter 102 of Wonder does not expand to release the balloon. Rather, it is the expansion of the collar 118 that releases the balloon (Figure 5, Column 7, lines 44-51). There is nothing in Wonder that discloses or suggests a catheter having a distal section that can be expanded to release an implant from the expandable distal section. As such, claim 33 is believed allowable over Wonder. For at least the same reason that claim 33 is

allowable over Wonder, claims 34-37, which depend from claim 33, are also believed allowable over Wonder.

Claims 38-49

Claims 38 and 44 each recites a delivery member having a coupling portion that changes configuration to release an occlusive device from the coupling portion. Wonder does not disclose or suggest such a device. Again, the catheter 102 of Wonder does not change configuration or shape to release the balloon from the catheter 102. There is nothing in Wonder that discloses or suggests a delivery member having a coupling portion that changes configuration or shape to release an occlusive device from the coupling portion. As such, claims 38 and 44 are believed allowable over Wonder. For at least the same reason that claims 38 and 44 are allowable over Wonder, claims 39-43, which depend from claim 38, and claims 45-49, which depend from claim 44, are also believed allowable over Wonder.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all remaining claims are believed in condition for allowance. If, the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: 8/27/03

By: 
Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
(650) 849-4960